

REMARKS

The claim amendments find support throughout the specification. As explained on page 8 of the BPAI decision, “[t]he test for determining compliance with the written description requirement is whether the disclosure of the application as originally filed reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession at that time of the later claimed subject matter, rather than the presence or absence of literal support in the specification for the claim language.” *In re Kaslow*, 707 F.2d 1366, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

The amendments are moot in view of the claim amendments, the cited references do not disclose or suggest a method comprising decoupled continuous process operating at different rates.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees filed, asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account 14-1437. Please credit any excess fees to such account.

NOVAK DRUCE & QUIGG, LLP
1300 Eye St. N.W.
Suite 1000 West
Washington, D.C. 20005

Phone: (202) 659-0100
Fax: (202) 659-0105

Respectfully submitted,
NOVAK DRUCE & QUIGG, LLP

/Michael P. Byrne/

Michael P. Byrne
Registration No.: 54,015